

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: O. Mios 1400 Alexa dria Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,091	06/28/2002	Gilbert Wolrich	10559-310US1	7309
7	7590 02/07/2006		EXAMINER	
Fish & Richardson 225 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110-2804			PAN, DANIEL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Boston, Wirt	02110 200 1		2183	
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/070,091	WOLRICH ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Daniel Pan	2183			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period fo	, -					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 N</u>	ovember 2005.				
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
·	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)🖂	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers		·			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
•	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∍ 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
•	see the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive				
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Infori	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/070,091 Page 2

Art Unit: 2183

1. Claims 1-22 remain for examination.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3. Rejection to Claim 21 has been withdrawn based on a newly updated version of

guidelines on 02/17/06. The program product stored in the computer readable medium

defined the structural and functional relations (managing the threads) of the computer

program product and other elements in the claim 21.

4. Claims 1 and clams 12, 21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created

doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18, 2,

respectively, of copending Application No. 09/760,509. Although the conflicting claims

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the

reasons given set forth in the last Office action on 08/29/05.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al (The Compiler for Supporting Multithreading in Cyclic Register Windows", 1996.
- 6. As to the amended futures of claim 1, it will be addressed in the response to applicant's remarks below.
- 7. Claim 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Panwar et al. (5,870,597).
- 8. The rejections are maintained and incorporated by reference the last Office action on 08/29/05.
- 9. The response filed on 11/25/05 has been fully considered but is not persuasive.
- 10. In the remarks applicant argued that :
- a) Multithread processor and register set are tangible;
- b) Panwar did not teach nor suggest that processes, or program specified the register actual physical address, and the physical addresses were only subsequently

Application/Control Number: 10/070,091 Page 4

Art Unit: 2183

determined when the logical addresses were mapped to the corresponding physical addresses:

- c) Chan did not teach how the registers were accessed;
- d) Panwar did not suggest the use of dual port.
- e) applicant's claim 10 clamed an absolute address of a register is directly specified in a source filed or destination filed of an instruction.
- 11. As to a) above, applicant clearly taught that the his multithreaded processor (12,20) can use freeware available over the internet (see page 2, lines 10-15). While the multithreaded processor can be a hardware, the freeware available over the internet is not. It is not sure what applicant intended to cover. The method of maintaining execution of multithreaded in multithreaded processor could be a mere program without a computer readable storage storing the threads. Furthermore, the register set without a functional descriptive material stored therein is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement (see discussion already set forth in page 2 of the last Office action).

12. As to b), e) above, applicant is reminded that unclaimed features cannot be used to overcome the prior art (e.g. see <u>CCPA In re Lundenberg & Zuschlag</u>, 113, USPQ 530, 534 (1957)). For example, nowhere does applicant claim recite that the

Application/Control Number: 10/070,091

Art Unit: 2183

physical addresses must not subsequently determined when the logical addresses were mapped, must by directly used, or the like. The claim only recites: "...registers that are relatively and absolutely addressable...". The fact that Panwar's relative addresses mapped to physical addresses does not means that the registers were not physically addressable. The registers in Panwar were physically addressable by the relative addresses. The claim does not recite whether the registers are directly addressable by physical addresses. Nevertheless, even if applicant has the dependent feature (claim 10) of an instruction field for directly specifying the absolute address register, Panwar taught that his register set was physically accessible by address register [304] and current pointer CWP [306] (see col.7, lines 48-50), and that the current window pointer [306] acted as an offset to address the registers in the register set (see col.7, lines 55-57). Panwar further taught a SPARC instruction [SAVE] allocated new register window and saved the prior register window by incrementing the current window pointer [CWP] (see col.7,, lines 62-67, col.8, lines 1-5). Therefore, the CWP pointer (acted as offset address and physically accessing the registers) must be an operand or a field specified in the instruction format of the SAVE instruction so that the CWP pointer could be incremented by the instruction. Therefore, Pawar's SAVE instruction field [CWP], though not explicitly shown, was used for directly specifying the absolute address of a register.

Page 5

13. As to c), Chan taught registers parts may be addressed by a calling procedure (see Section 3 Page 58). The call statement itself is a relative addressing because it is

Application/Control Number: 10/070,091

Art Unit: 2183

the programming statement by programmer. The call statement was also directed to a physical address because it needs to know the target location of registers;

14. As to d), Panwar taught related application disclosing multi-ported memory in the background (see col.1, lines 43-47). Since the background provided framework for Panwar, the Examiner holds that dual ported memory had been known. The related application supported Examiner's position.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Pan whose telephone number is 703 305 9696, or the new number 571 272 4172. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/070,091 Page 7

Art Unit: 2183

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chan, can be reached on 703 305 9712, or the new number 571 272 4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 306 5404.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

21 Century Strategic Plan